

Serial No. 10/672,772  
Atty. Doc. No. 2003P14907US

### REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 15 - 17, cancelled claims 1 and 11, and added new claim 18. Thus, claims 2 - 10 and 12 - 18 are presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### Allowable Subject Matter:

The Examiner indicated that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 2 has been rewritten in such a manner. In view of the amendment to claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is in condition for allowance as well as dependent claims 3 - 10 and 18 which depend from claim 2.

The Examiner indicated that claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 17 has been rewritten in such a manner. In view of the amendment to claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is in condition for allowance as well as dependent claims 12 - 16 which depend from claim 17.

#### Response to Objections to the Drawings:

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings do not contain informalities and respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

#### Response to Objections to the Specification:

The Examiner has objected to the specifications for informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification contains proper antecedent basis for the term "duct" and respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

7

Response to 02-28-2007 OA filed May 24, 2007 CKM

**Serial No. 10/672,772**

**Atty. Doc. No. 2003P14907US**

**Response to rejections under Section 112:**

Claims 5, 7, 8, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have cancelled claim 1.

Regarding claims 5, 8, 15, and 16, Applicants have amended claims as suggested by Examiner.

Regarding claim 7, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification does contain sufficient subject matter to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, to make and/or use the invention. The specification provides how the barrier layer is chemically bonded to the substrate via formation of a nickel aluminide zone; see e.g. Specification page 11 line 26 - page 12 line 11. The specification also provides how the barrier layer is mechanically bonded to the substrate by either lightly abrading or oxidized; see e.g. Specification page 12 line 29 - page 13 line 10.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of rejections under Section 112.

**Response to rejections under Section 102:**

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McCarty et al. (US 6,015,285). Examiner apparently reads McCarty as disclosing Applicants claimed invention.

Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and amended claims 3 – 10 to depend from amended claim 2. Applicants have cancelled claim 11 and amended claims 12 – 16 to depend from amended claim 17. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejection.

**Discussion of New Claim 18:**

New claim 18 further defines the scope of the invention as described in the specification and drawings. In particular, claim 18 recites the barrier layer on the other side of the duct wall is up to approximately 25% denser than the barrier layer containing the catalyst. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is patentable and respectfully request allowance of claim 18.


**Serial No. 10/672,772**  
**Atty. Doc. No. 2003P14907US**

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

By:   
Charles K. Middleton  
Registration No. 60,275  
(407) 736-5318

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

**Serial No. 10/672,772**  
**Atty. Doc. No. 2003P14907US**

**Amendments To The Drawings:**

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a), stating the drawings must show each and every feature of the invention. Referring to Figure 5, Applicants respectfully submit that as stated per claim 1, both the inside wall (308) and outside wall (306) of the duct being lined with a barrier layer (304 or 302) and one or the other of the inside wall (308) or outside wall (306) has a catalyst coating (302) over at least part of the barrier layer, does show each and every feature. Applicants respectfully note that item 302 and item 304 are both barrier layers; however, item 302 includes a catalyst. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings do show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.